

Serial No. 09/821,969

Atty. Docket No. 19480-2506RE

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 31, 2003. By way of this amendment, claims 1, 8, 13, 20, 25 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the application. Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmier et al, although it appears that claims 25 and 26 were intended to be rejected on this basis. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Schmier et al discloses a system of notifying waiting passengers of information (such as estimated arrival times) involving public transit vehicles. The system includes a central processor 22 in wireless communication with a microprocessor 16 on one or more vehicles 12 to receive vehicle location data from GPS devices on the vehicles 12. The central processor 22 is also in communication with electronic storage means 24 that contains information about the vehicles 12 in communication with the central processor 22 and these vehicles' routes. The central processor 22 uses the location data and stored information to compute a "transit data table" that includes status information such as predicted vehicle arrival times and passenger loads. The transit data table, along with other information such as news and advertisements, can be displayed on a display module 30, which is in communication with the central processor 22.

Independent claim 25 recites a method of selectively displaying digital information at one or more of a plurality of locations. The method includes the step of receiving control instructions from at least one information mediator, and claim 25 has been amended herein to specify that the information mediator is an external information mediator. Support for this amendment is found throughout the present specification. Please note that, as specified in column 5,

Serial No. 09/821,969

Atty. Docket No. 19480-2506RE

lines 9-26 of the present specification, the term "information mediator" refers to all companies (including but not limited to advertising agencies) and private persons who wish to utilize the present invention for commercial reasons or for the display of information that concerns a general public.

~~Schmier et al~~ fails to teach or suggest the step of receiving control instructions from at least one external information mediator. ~~The~~ central processor 22 of ~~Schmier et al~~ is described as receiving vehicle location data from the vehicle microprocessor 16 and other vehicle-related data from the electronic storage means 24. However, it is respectfully submitted that neither the microprocessor 16 nor the electronic storage means 24 can properly be considered to be an "external information mediator." Both the microprocessor 16 and the electronic storage means 24 are key elements of the system of ~~Schmier et al~~ and are thus not external to the system. In addition, neither of these elements is an information mediator as the term is defined in the present application (i.e., companies and private persons who wish to display information to a general public). Accordingly, it is submitted that ~~Schmier et al~~ does not disclose the claimed step of receiving control instructions from at least one external information mediator.

Claim 25 also recites the step of using the control instructions to generate an exposure list. The claim has been amended to recite that the exposure list specifies three or more of the following items:

- i) what information content is to be displayed;
- ii) at which of said plurality of locations said information content is to be displayed;
- iii) when said information content is to be displayed for each location at which content is to be displayed; and
- iv) how long said information content is to be displayed for each location at which content is to be displayed.

Serial No. 09/821,969

Atty. Docket No. 19480-2506RE

The Examiner alleges that the transit data table computed by the central processor 22 of Schmier et al corresponds to the claimed exposure list. However, the transit data table contains predicted vehicle time intervals, arrival times and passenger load levels. This information is broadcast by the central processor 22 to the display modules 30 for display thereon. As such, the transit data table merely specifies display content and does not specify the locations at which particular information content is to be displayed, when information content is to be displayed for each location at which content is to be displayed, and how long information content is to be displayed for each location at which content is to be displayed. While the transit data table contains information relating to predicted time intervals between adjacent transit stops and predicted times of arrival, the transit data table does not specify where a piece of information is to be displayed, when the information is to be displayed, and how long the information is to be displayed. These aspects are dictated by other factors. For example, Schmier et al describes continually updating the information in near real time (column 10, lines 3-6). Because the information is updated, and thus changed, as soon as it is received by the central processor 22, *how long* a piece of information is displayed is controlled by the frequency of the updates, not by anything in the transit data table. Also, while Schmier et al mentions displaying other types of information (such as news and advertising) at selective displays, there is no indication in Schmier et al that the specific location and timing of such displays would be controlled by the transit data table.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Schmier et al does not disclose generating an exposure list as claimed and thus fails to anticipate claim 25.

Independent claim 26 recites a system for selectively displaying digital information at one or more of a plurality of locations. The system includes

Serial No. 09/821,969

Atty. Docket No. 19480-2506RE

a computerized control center having a plurality of communication interfaces for receiving control instructions from at least one information mediator and means for generating and dynamically updating an exposure list from the control instructions. Like claim 25, claim 26 has been amended to recite that the information mediator is an external information mediator and the exposure list specifies three or more of the following items:

- i) what information content is to be displayed;
- ii) at which of said plurality of locations said information content is to be displayed;
- iii) when said information content is to be displayed for each location at which content is to be displayed; and
- iv) how long said information content is to be displayed for each location at which content is to be displayed.

It is respectfully submitted that Schmier et al does not disclose a computerized control center having a plurality of communication interfaces for receiving control instructions from at least one external information mediator. As discussed above, the central processor 22 of Schmier et al receives data from the vehicle microprocessor 16 and the electronic storage means 24, but neither the microprocessor 16 nor the electronic storage means 24 comprises an "external information mediator" for the reasons set forth above. Schmier et al also does not disclose a computerized control center that generates an exposure list which specifies three or more of the claimed items. As discussed above, the transit data table the central processor 22 does not specify *where* a piece of information is to be displayed, *when* the information is to be displayed, and *how long* the information is to be displayed.

For all of the above reasons, applicant respectfully submits that Schmier et al fails to anticipate claims 25 and 26.

Serial No. 09/821,969

Atty. Docket No. 19480-2506RE

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmier et al in view of Vogeley et al. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to provide the display system of Schmier et al with a projector type LCD as taught by Vogeley et al. However, even if such a modification were made, the resulting combination would still fail to teach use of an external information mediator as required by independent claims 1 and 13. As described above, Schmier et al does not disclose means for receiving information from an "external information mediator." Vogeley et al clearly does not suggest receiving information or instructions from an external information mediator. Furthermore, the proposed combination of Schmier et al and Vogeley et al would fail to suggest receiving display information that includes booking information for reserving and controlling a time-period for display as required by claims 1 and 13. Schmier et al provides information related to vehicle arrival times and passenger loading levels and other information such as news and advertising, but there is no disclosure of "booking information" for reserving and controlling display times. The combination of Schmier et al and Vogeley et al would also fail to suggest coordinating and controlling select ones of a plurality of projectors as required by claims 1 and 13.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over Schmier et al in view of Vogeley et al. Claims 2-12 and 14-24 depend from claim 1 and 13, respectively, and are thus also believed to be allowable. Furthermore, at least some of these dependent claims set forth limitations not met by the prior art.

Serial No. 09/821,969

Atty. Docket No. 19480-2506RE

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-26 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

2/2/04

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Patrick R. Scanlon
Reg. No. 34,500
207-791-1276